FERNALD/ANL-W PROGRAM REVIEWS

A TALE OF TWO CITIES

DENNIS RILEY, DOE-FEMP HOWARD WILCHINS, EH-10

FERNALD/ANL-W PROGRAM REVIEWS

BACKGROUND

- **♦ PAAA Program Reviews, an EH-Enforcement initiative, started in 1999**
- ♦ Objectives: encourage effective programs, promote uniformity, provide mechanism for lessons-learned
- ♦ Fernald review conducted 11/99; ANL-W review conducted 9/99 with follow-up review 9/00

STRENGTHS--

- ♦ Viewed as an effective overall program
- **♦** Positive program elements:
 - Broad scope of sources reviewed for potential noncompliances
 - Use of qualified SMEs for screening
 - PAAA Annual Report--provides management a perspective

STRENGTHS (Continued)

- ♦ Noncompliance database allows for easy searching, trending
- **♦ QA Manager effectively functioning as PAAA**Coordinator
- ♦ Effective 10 CFR 835 triennial review system-covers all areas

Strengths (Continued)

♦ Strong corrective action closure and validation process by both Project Level and QA

♦ Strong positive support from senior management

DEFICIENCIES

- Procedural Weaknesses:
 - -- Language implies event must involve movement/handling of RAM to be in PAAA space, must have potential for grave harm to report to NTS
 - -- No detail/guidance on trending for repetitive or programmatic issues

Deficiencies (Continued)

- ♦ Programmatic/roll-up NTS reports being generated, however, root cause for such reports not consistently performed
- **♦** Above deficiencies not significantly impacting performance; identification, screening and reporting effectively being done

DOE-FEMP OVERSIGHT

- ◆ DOE-FEMP performs day to day oversight of contractor PAAA Program (review of draft NTS reports, draft CA plans, discussion of events
- ♦ DOE-FEMP, with DOE-OH support, has also conducted annual appraisals of contractor PAAA Program since 1997

DOE-FEMP OVERSIGHT (Continued)

- **♦ Team approach--provides in-depth review of contractor PAAA activities**
- ♦ Each review follows-up issues from previous; result is continuous improvement of program

DOE-FEMP OVERSIGHT (Continued)

- **♦ DOE-FEMP 1999 appraisal completed one month prior to EH-Enforcement review**
- ♦ EH-Enforcement review effectively validated FEMP's review; identified same findings. Enforcement report commented on similarities to FEMP's review.
- ♦ Net result Stronger message to contractor; demonstration of consensus between DOE HQ and Field

- **♦** Multiple deficiencies noted; no strengths reported
- ◆ Limited information sources available to Coordinator; consequent emphasis almost entirely on events with no noncompliances reported as a result of assessments
- ♦ PAAA procedure did not describe screening process, training requirements, closure/verification of corrective actions; required only an annual review for trends.

ANL-W Deficiencies (Continued)

- ♦ Majority of processes used for tracking/disposition of quality problems not formal--no procedure, utilized on optional basis
- ♦ Contractor utilizing multiple division-specific systems to track assessment findings; no capability for overall tracking/trending.

 Multiple findings never entered on systems.

Deficiencies (Continued)

- **♦** Cause determinations not performed for significant, reportable noncompliances
- **♦** Significant percentage of corrective actions overdue

Follow-up Review

- **♦ Follow-up review performed one year later** (September 2000)
- **♦** Little progress noted--efforts initiated, not effectively implemented

Summary

- ♦ PAAA Coordinator oversight activities can have a significant impact on contractor program adequacy.
- ♦ Periodic external reviews can provide program calibration and can complement/enhance significance of internal reviews.

FERNALD/ANL-W PROGRAM REVIEWS

Reason for Differences Between Programs

- **♦** Need contractor program champion
- **♦** Need recognition of program importance by senior contractor and DOE management
- **♦** May need enforcement action

DOE PRICE-ANDERSON COORDINATORS TRAINING

OPEN DISCUSSION

November 29, 2000